# Existence Is Infinite

Moderators: AMod, iMod

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Thu Jan 30, 2025 6:18 pm

**Eodnhoj7**
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 7:43 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 29, 2025 10:08 pm
> >
> > > **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 29, 2025 8:55 pm
> > > DJL … I have a question, if like you say, NOTHINGNESS is nonsensical, and can never be. Then is that saying also part of "infinite existence", and so can be, can exist?
> >
> > Relative nothingness is nonsensical.
> >
> > Nothingness is a contradictory concept. The concept exists. A concept is a thing. A thing is [part of] existence.
> >
> > Nothingness is an abstraction constructed in the mind and projected outward through concept and language.
> >
> > It is apparent you have changed your username from one previously used. We have already discussed these topics: viewtopic.php?p=654347#p654347
>
> This subject is obviously a subject that's endless, so it's hardly going to be resolved anytime soon, well not until everyone involved in the debate is able to fully comprehend what you're saying.
>
> So back to the subject….another question I have for you is: …… Is " infinite existence " illusory? An illusion?

I comprehend what he is saying, he cannot comprehend that he is trying to avoid paradoxes by selective word choice...which still does not solve the problem.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Fairy** » Thu Jan 30, 2025 7:01 pm

**Fairy**
Posts: 2631
Joined: Thu May 09, 2024 7:07 pm
Location: The United Kingdom of Heaven

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 6:18 pm
>
> > **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 7:43 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 29, 2025 10:08 pm
> > >
> > > Relative nothingness is nonsensical.
> > >
> > > Nothingness is a contradictory concept. The concept exists. A concept is a thing. A thing is [part of] existence.
> > >
> > > Nothingness is an abstraction constructed in the mind and projected outward through concept and language.
> > >
> > > It is apparent you have changed your username from one previously used. We have already discussed these topics: viewtopic.php?p=654347#p654347
> >
> > This subject is obviously a subject that's endless, so it's hardly going to be resolved anytime soon, well not until everyone involved in the debate is able to fully comprehend what you're saying.
> >
> > So back to the subject….another question I have for you is: …… Is " infinite existence " illusory? An illusion?
>
> I comprehend what he is saying, he cannot comprehend that he is trying to avoid paradoxes by selective word choice...which still does not solve the problem.

Surely even the word "infinite" implies a duality, which would mean the word "infinite" is a thing which is finite.
So yeah it's like he's bypassing the paradox.

The absolute truth cannot be named without making it a thing which is finite. And so how can a finite thing know anything about an infinite.

" What is" is without doubt or error, but cannot be named or given form as a thing named.
And yet he denies this "no thingness" existence.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Fri Jan 31, 2025 12:12 am

**Eodnhoj7**
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 7:01 pm
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 6:18 pm
> >
> > > **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 7:43 am
> > >
> > > This subject is obviously a subject that's endless, so it's hardly going to be resolved anytime soon, well not until everyone involved in the debate is able to fully comprehend what you're saying.
> > >
> > > So back to the subject….another question I have for you is: …… Is " infinite existence " illusory? An illusion?
> >
> > I comprehend what he is saying, he cannot comprehend that he is trying to avoid paradoxes by selective word choice...which still does not solve the problem.
>
> Surely even the word "infinite" implies a duality, which would mean the word "infinite" is a thing which is finite.
> So yeah it's like he's bypassing the paradox.
>
> The absolute truth cannot be named without making it a thing which is finite. And so how can a finite thing know anything about an infinite.
>
> " What is" is without doubt or error, but cannot be named or given form as a thing named.
> And yet he denies this "no thingness" existence.

Yeah, I addressed that along time ago. He is trying to avoid the full range of paradoxes to his fault. If he would accept them as inherent and necessary to existence, as existence, his thesis would be stronger. That is why I say, with minimal ego, the "occurence metaphysic" I propose is a clearer approach in the respect it is a transitionally oriented philosophy both conducive to and allowing change within a rational framework.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Fri Jan 31, 2025 3:24 am

**daniel j lavender**
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 3:29 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 12:33 am
> >
> > > **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 12:06 am
> > > AND AGAIN, to "daniel j lavender" 'Existence', Itself, is NOT A 'thing'.
> >
> > Existence is a thing and all other things.
>
> If existence is a thing then what other thing does it compare to for it to be distinct, as it encompasses all things? If it compares to itself it is fragmented, if it compares to nothing then nothing is an existing thing, if it has no comparison then it is nothing...so what is its comparison that allows it to be a thing?

It depends on what the thing is.

A thing is a thing. A thing is not all things.

Existence is both part and whole however part is still part and whole is still whole.

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 3:31 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 29, 2025 5:40 pm
> >
> > > **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jan 27, 2025 12:10 pm
> > > So, if 'things' are finite, and, 'Existence' is infinite, then 'Existence' is NOT A 'thing'. Well to "daniel j lavender" anyway.
> >
> > Existence is infinite. Existence is not limited. Existence is not limited to only one thing or the whole. Existence, being unlimited, is both part and whole. Review the Existence Both Part And Whole section of the original essay.
> >
> > A thing is limited yet still [part of] existence. The unlimitedness of existence includes the limitedness of things.
>
> If existence is unlimited, and we only sense limits, than existence (by your definition of it) is nonsense.

Perspective is limited. We can only see so far into the universe. We can only see so much of the ocean from the shore. Because of this we are inclined to limit existence. However we can use our cognitive abilities to see more.

The philosophy is not based exclusively on sensory perception. Review the Significance Of Perception section of the original essay.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Fri Jan 31, 2025 3:33 am

**daniel j lavender**
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 4:07 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 12:33 am
> >
> > > **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 12:06 am
> > > AND AGAIN, to "daniel j lavender" 'Existence', Itself, is NOT A 'thing'.
> >
> > Existence is a thing and all other things.
>
> So, if 'things' are finite, and, 'Existence' is meant to be A 'thing', then, HOW EXACTLY, can the 'thing' 'Existence' NOT be finite and supposedly be infinite?

Existence is a thing in *part*. A thing is finite.

However existence is not limited to only a thing or only a part, existence is all. Existence is infinite.

Again, review the Existence Both Part And Whole section of the essay. This is also explained here:

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Dec 19, 2024 5:04 am
> As expressed existence is infinite and finite. The unlimitedness of existence is not limited to unlimitedness. Review the Existence Both Part And Whole section beneath Additional Notes of the original essay.
>
> Existence is finite. An orange is [part of] existence. An orange is finite, it's limited. The orange is limited to the orange. However existence is also unlimited, existence is infinite. Existence is the orange, and the tree, and the grove, and the farm, and the town, and the nation, and the planet and so on.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Fri Jan 31, 2025 3:51 am

**daniel j lavender**
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 12:12 am
>
> > **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 7:01 pm
> >
> > > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 6:18 pm
> > > I comprehend what he is saying, he cannot comprehend that he is trying to avoid paradoxes by selective word choice...which still does not solve the problem.
> >
> > Surely even the word "infinite" implies a duality, which would mean the word "infinite" is a thing which is finite.
> > So yeah it's like he's bypassing the paradox.
> >
> > The absolute truth cannot be named without making it a thing which is finite. And so how can a finite thing know anything about an infinite.
> >
> > " What is" is without doubt or error, but cannot be named or given form as a thing named.
> > And yet he denies this "no thingness" existence.
>
> Yeah, I addressed that along time ago. He is trying to avoid the full range of paradoxes to his fault. If he would accept them as inherent and necessary to existence, as existence, his thesis would be stronger. That is why I say, with minimal ego, the "occurence metaphysic" I propose is a clearer approach in the respect it is a transitionally oriented philosophy both conducive to and allowing change within a rational framework.

By full range of paradoxes you mean relative nothingness and by extension a relative no-thing for every thing:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2025 1:12 am
> If a chair exists than the absence of a tree being there, an absence of a table being there, an absence of "x" being there represents an absence of certain things being there. This is a relative no-thing, a relative nothingness. This relative absence is a thing thus a relative nothingness occurs.
>
> Relative Nothingness is a thing, thus nothingness exists.
>
> If a thing is relative to perception than a relative absence, as a thing, also occurs as part of perception. Relative nothingness can be observed, thus relative nothingness is a thing. Existence requires nothingness.
>
> Absence is quite sensicle. Considering an infinite number of things occurs there is an infinite nothingness through which these things occur.
>
> You cannot escape the full range of paradoxes by which reality occurs.

It is nonsense.

Every thing indicates all things. All things are all things and lack no thing. Nothing, nothingness is nowhere in the equation. With relative nothingness the abstraction of nothingness is needlessly, awkwardly forced into the situation.

Relative nothingness is nonsensical, it is a misnomer. There is not nothingness, or nothing, anywhere in the equation. Only things are involved. Things, and qualities of things, are used to distinguish other things and other qualities of other things. Not nothing. The term nothingness is needlessly and inappropriately attached to the already sufficient terms of absence and relativity.

Although relative nothingness may be a nonsensical concept and may not necessarily apply it is nevertheless a thing, a part of existence.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Fri Jan 31, 2025 5:41 am

**Eodnhoj7**
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 3:24 am
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 3:29 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 12:33 am
> > >
> > > Existence is a thing and all other things.
> >
> > If existence is a thing then what other thing does it compare to for it to be distinct, as it encompasses all things? If it compares to itself it is fragmented, if it compares to nothing then nothing is an existing thing, if it has no comparison then it is nothing...so what is its comparison that allows it to be a thing?
>
> It depends on what the thing is.
>
> A thing is a thing. A thing is not all things.
>
> Existence is both part and whole however part is still part and whole is still whole.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 3:31 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Jan 29, 2025 5:40 pm
> > >
> > > Existence is infinite. Existence is not limited. Existence is not limited to only one thing or the whole. Existence, being unlimited, is both part and whole. Review the Existence Both Part And Whole section of the original essay.
> > >
> > > A thing is limited yet still [part of] existence. The unlimitedness of existence includes the limitedness of things.
> >
> > If existence is unlimited, and we only sense limits, than existence (by your definition of it) is nonsense.
>
> Perspective is limited. We can only see so far into the universe. We can only see so much of the ocean from the shore. Because of this we are inclined to limit existence. However we can use our cognitive abilities to see more.
>
> The philosophy is not based exclusively on sensory perception. Review the Significance Of Perception section of the original essay.

If "a thing is not all things" then existence is not a thing and yet you claim it is.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Fri Jan 31, 2025 5:42 am

**Eodnhoj7**
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 3:51 am
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 12:12 am
> >
> > > **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 7:01 pm
> > >
> > > Surely even the word "infinite" implies a duality, which would mean the word "infinite" is a thing which is finite.
> > > So yeah it's like he's bypassing the paradox.
> > >
> > > The absolute truth cannot be named without making it a thing which is finite. And so how can a finite thing know anything about an infinite.
> > >
> > > " What is" is without doubt or error, but cannot be named or given form as a thing named.
> > > And yet he denies this "no thingness" existence.
> >
> > Yeah, I addressed that along time ago. He is trying to avoid the full range of paradoxes to his fault. If he would accept them as inherent and necessary to existence, as existence, his thesis would be stronger. That is why I say, with minimal ego, the "occurence metaphysic" I propose is a clearer approach in the respect it is a transitionally oriented philosophy both conducive to and allowing change within a rational framework.
>
> By full range of paradoxes you mean relative nothingness and by extension a relative no-thing for every thing:
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2025 1:12 am
> > If a chair exists than the absence of a tree being there, an absence of a table being there, an absence of "x" being there represents an absence of certain things being there. This is a relative no-thing, a relative nothingness. This relative absence is a thing thus a relative nothingness occurs.
> >
> > Relative Nothingness is a thing, thus nothingness exists.
> >
> > If a thing is relative to perception than a relative absence, as a thing, also occurs as part of perception. Relative nothingness can be observed, thus relative nothingness is a thing. Existence requires nothingness.
> >
> > Absence is quite sensicle. Considering an infinite number of things occurs there is an infinite nothingness through which these things occur.
> >
> > You cannot escape the full range of paradoxes by which reality occurs.
>
> It is nonsense.
>
> Every thing indicates all things. All things are all things and lack no thing. Nothing, nothingness is nowhere in the equation. With relative nothingness the abstraction of nothingness is needlessly, awkwardly forced into the situation.
>
> Relative nothingness is nonsensical, it is a misnomer. There is not nothingness, or nothing, anywhere in the equation. Only things are involved. Things, and qualities of things, are used to distinguish other things and other qualities of other things. Not nothing. The term nothingness is needlessly and inappropriately attached to the already sufficient terms of absence and relativity.
>
> Although relative nothingness may be a nonsensical concept and may not necessarily apply it is nevertheless a thing, a part of existence.

....the thing of a tree lacks the thing of a car....unless you are arguing a tree is a car...

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Fri Jan 31, 2025 10:28 am

**Age**
Posts: 26385
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

Online

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 3:33 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 4:07 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 12:33 am
> > >
> > > Existence is a thing and all other things.
> >
> > So, if 'things' are finite, and, 'Existence' is meant to be A 'thing', then, HOW EXACTLY, can the 'thing' 'Existence' NOT be finite and supposedly be infinite?
>
> Existence is a thing in *part*. A thing is finite.
>
> However existence is not limited to only a thing or only a part, existence is all. Existence is infinite.

Therefore, according to your 'logic', 'existence' is NOT A 'thing'. Again, BECAUSE 'things' are finite.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 3:33 am
> Again, review the Existence Both Part And Whole section of the essay. This is also explained here:
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Dec 19, 2024 5:04 am
> > As expressed existence is infinite and finite. The unlimitedness of existence is not limited to unlimitedness. Review the Existence Both Part And Whole section beneath Additional Notes of the original essay.
> >
> > Existence is finite. An orange is [part of] existence. An orange is finite, it's limited. The orange is limited to the orange. However existence is also unlimited, existence is infinite. Existence is the orange, and the tree, and the grove, and the farm, and the town, and the nation, and the planet and so on.

BUT, 'existence' IS 'existence'. AND, just like A 'tree' is NOT an 'orange', a 'grove', a 'farm', a 'town', a 'nation', NOR a 'planet', so to is 'existence', itself, NOT ANY of those things AS WELL.

Look, you can 'TRY' and USE words in ANY WAY you like, in the hope that 'the way' you USE words will help you in supporting your BELIEF, here.

But, if you are not gaining AGREEMENT, and ACCEPTANCE, then WHY do you think this is, EXACTLY?

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Fairy** » Fri Jan 31, 2025 4:17 pm

**Fairy**
Posts: 2631
Joined: Thu May 09, 2024 7:07 pm
Location: The United Kingdom of Heaven

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 12:12 am
>
> > **Fairy** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 7:01 pm
> >
> > > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 6:18 pm
> > >
> > > I comprehend what he is saying, he cannot comprehend that he is trying to avoid paradoxes by selective word choice...which still does not solve the problem.
> >
> > Surely even the word "infinite" implies a duality, which would mean the word "infinite" is a thing which is finite.
> > So yeah it's like he's bypassing the paradox.
> >
> > The absolute truth cannot be named without making it a thing which is finite. And so how can a finite thing know anything about an infinite.
> >
> > " What is" is without doubt or error, but cannot be named or given form as a thing named.
> > And yet he denies this "no thingness" existence.
>
> Yeah, I addressed that along time ago. He is trying to avoid the full range of paradoxes to his fault. If he would accept them as inherent and necessary to existence, as existence, his thesis would be stronger. That is why I say, with minimal ego, the "occurence metaphysic" I propose is a clearer approach in the respect it is a transitionally oriented philosophy both conducive to and allowing change within a rational framework.

Maybe what he means by infinite is that infinite can only be actualised within the finite. To talk about the infinite, you can only say...(in finite, everything is infinite) infinite appears to itself as and through finite form infinitely for eternity.
So the paradox is included in the discussion, a paradox is part of his infinite existence theory.
That's the only way I can make sense of what he is saying.

Google says no one can know if existence is infinite because conscious entities only experience finite lives, never infinite lives.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Fri Jan 31, 2025 8:19 pm

**daniel j lavender**
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 5:41 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 3:24 am
> >
> > > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 3:29 am
> > > If existence is a thing then what other thing does it compare to for it to be distinct, as it encompasses all things? If it compares to itself it is fragmented, if it compares to nothing then nothing is an existing thing, if it has no comparison then it is nothing...so what is its comparison that allows it to be a thing?
> >
> > It depends on what the thing is.
> >
> > A thing is a thing. A thing is not all things.
> >
> > Existence is both part and whole however part is still part and whole is still whole.
> >
> > > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 3:31 am
> > > If existence is unlimited, and we only sense limits, than existence (by your definition of it) is nonsense.
> >
> > Perspective is limited. We can only see so far into the universe. We can only see so much of the ocean from the shore. Because of this we are inclined to limit existence. However we can use our cognitive abilities to see more.
> >
> > The philosophy is not based exclusively on sensory perception. Review the Significance Of Perception section of the original essay.
>
> If "a thing is not all things" then existence is not a thing and yet you claim it is.

As established in the essay and reiterated here in discussion numerous times existence is both part and whole.

A thing is [part of] existence.

All things are existence.

Existence is a thing. A word, a term, a concept. A term or concept indicating or referencing itself and all other things. Both as part and as the whole or the totality.

Existence is *that which is perceived, at least in part; that which is interacted with, at least in part, in some way.*

Existence is the word, the term and the concept. Existence is also a pineapple, a palm tree, a coconut and a pterodactyl. Existence is all of those things and all other things. Existence is infinite.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Fri Jan 31, 2025 8:55 pm

**daniel j lavender**
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 5:42 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 3:51 am
> >
> > > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 12:12 am
> > > Yeah, I addressed that along time ago. He is trying to avoid the full range of paradoxes to his fault. If he would accept them as inherent and necessary to existence, as existence, his thesis would be stronger. That is why I say, with minimal ego, the "occurence metaphysic" I propose is a clearer approach in the respect it is a transitionally oriented philosophy both conducive to and allowing change within a rational framework.
> >
> > By full range of paradoxes you mean relative nothingness and by extension a relative no-thing for every thing:
> >
> > > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2025 1:12 am
> > > If a chair exists than the absence of a tree being there, an absence of a table being there, an absence of "x" being there represents an absence of certain things being there. This is a relative no-thing, a relative nothingness. This relative absence is a thing thus a relative nothingness occurs.
> > >
> > > Relative Nothingness is a thing, thus nothingness exists.
> > >
> > > If a thing is relative to perception than a relative absence, as a thing, also occurs as part of perception. Relative nothingness can be observed, thus relative nothingness is a thing. Existence requires nothingness.
> > >
> > > Absence is quite sensicle. Considering an infinite number of things occurs there is an infinite nothingness through which these things occur.
> > >
> > > You cannot escape the full range of paradoxes by which reality occurs.
> >
> > It is nonsense.
> >
> > Every thing indicates all things. All things are all things and lack no thing. Nothing, nothingness is nowhere in the equation. With relative nothingness the abstraction of nothingness is needlessly, awkwardly forced into the situation.
> >
> > Relative nothingness is nonsensical, it is a misnomer. There is not nothingness, or nothing, anywhere in the equation. Only things are involved. Things, and qualities of things, are used to distinguish other things and other qualities of other things. Not nothing. The term nothingness is needlessly and inappropriately attached to the already sufficient terms of absence and relativity.
> >
> > Although relative nothingness may be a nonsensical concept and may not necessarily apply it is nevertheless a thing, a part of existence.
>
> ....the thing of a tree lacks the thing of a car....unless you are arguing a tree is a car...

The *thing* of a tree does not lack a thing. It *is* a thing.

I am stating a tree is a thing and a car is a thing. All things utilized to distinguish other things are other things.

You are attempting to limit existence to one thing or one location then using that as excuse to introduce nothing or a "relative no-thing". Existence is not limited. Existence is not limited to only one thing or only one location thus there is no excuse to introduce nothing.

Again with your own example you can't help but acknowledge a thing to acknowledge another indicating presence while also indicating multiplicity of things. Your own example reflects infinite existence.

You are referencing multiple things in attempt to introduce no thing.

You are attempting to explain existence through nonexistence. That does not clarify understanding, that convolutes understanding. Existence is explained by what is, not by what is not.

Relative nothingness is an awkward, silly concept. There isn't really relative nothingness. There are simply relative qualities and relative things.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Sat Feb 01, 2025 1:22 am

**Eodnhoj7**
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 8:19 pm
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 5:41 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 3:24 am
> > >
> > > It depends on what the thing is.
> > >
> > > A thing is a thing. A thing is not all things.
> > >
> > > Existence is both part and whole however part is still part and whole is still whole.
> > >
> > > Perspective is limited. We can only see so far into the universe. We can only see so much of the ocean from the shore. Because of this we are inclined to limit existence. However we can use our cognitive abilities to see more.
> > >
> > > The philosophy is not based exclusively on sensory perception. Review the Significance Of Perception section of the original essay.
> >
> > If "a thing is not all things" then existence is not a thing and yet you claim it is.
>
> As established in the essay and reiterated here in discussion numerous times existence is both part and whole.
>
> A thing is [part of] existence.
>
> All things are existence.
>
> Existence is a thing. A word, a term, a concept. A term or concept indicating or referencing itself and all other things. Both as part and as the whole or the totality.
>
> Existence is *that which is perceived, at least in part; that which is interacted with, at least in part, in some way.*
>
> Existence is the word, the term and the concept. Existence is also a pineapple, a palm tree, a coconut and a pterodactyl. Existence is all of those things and all other things. Existence is infinite.

If existence is just a concept or word than your truth is merely rhetorical.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Sat Feb 01, 2025 1:22 am

**Eodnhoj7**
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 8:55 pm
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 5:42 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 3:51 am
> > >
> > > By full range of paradoxes you mean relative nothingness and by extension a relative no-thing for every thing:
> > >
> > > It is nonsense.
> > >
> > > Every thing indicates all things. All things are all things and lack no thing. Nothing, nothingness is nowhere in the equation. With relative nothingness the abstraction of nothingness is needlessly, awkwardly forced into the situation.
> > >
> > > Relative nothingness is nonsensical, it is a misnomer. There is not nothingness, or nothing, anywhere in the equation. Only things are involved. Things, and qualities of things, are used to distinguish other things and other qualities of other things. Not nothing. The term nothingness is needlessly and inappropriately attached to the already sufficient terms of absence and relativity.
> > >
> > > Although relative nothingness may be a nonsensical concept and may not necessarily apply it is nevertheless a thing, a part of existence.
> >
> > ....the thing of a tree lacks the thing of a car....unless you are arguing a tree is a car...
>
> The *thing* of a tree does not lack a thing. It *is* a thing.
>
> I am stating a tree is a thing and a car is a thing. All things utilized to distinguish other things are other things.
>
> You are attempting to limit existence to one thing or one location then using that as excuse to introduce nothing or a "relative no-thing". Existence is not limited. Existence is not limited to only one thing or only one location thus there is no excuse to introduce nothing.
>
> Again with your own example you can't help but acknowledge a thing to acknowledge another indicating presence while also indicating multiplicity of things. Your own example reflects infinite existence.
>
> You are referencing multiple things in attempt to introduce no thing.
>
> You are attempting to explain existence through nonexistence. That does not clarify understanding, that convolutes understanding. Existence is explained by what is, not by what is not.
>
> Relative nothingness is an awkward, silly concept. There isn't really relative nothingness. There are simply relative qualities and relative things.

If a thing such as a tree does not lack a thing than it does not lack the thing of a car.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Sat Feb 01, 2025 1:41 am

**daniel j lavender**
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 10:28 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 3:33 am
> >
> > > **Age** wrote: ↑ Thu Jan 30, 2025 4:07 am
> > > So, if 'things' are finite, and, 'Existence' is meant to be A 'thing', then, HOW EXACTLY, can the 'thing' 'Existence' NOT be finite and supposedly be infinite?
> >
> > Existence is a thing in *part*. A thing is finite.
> >
> > However existence is not limited to only a thing or only a part, existence is all. Existence is infinite.
>
> Therefore, according to your 'logic', 'existence' is NOT A 'thing'. Again, BECAUSE 'things' are finite.
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Fri Jan 31, 2025 3:33 am
> > Again, review the Existence Both Part And Whole section of the essay. This is also explained here:
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Dec 19, 2024 5:04 am
> > > As expressed existence is infinite and finite. The unlimitedness of existence is not limited to unlimitedness. Review the Existence Both Part And Whole section beneath Additional Notes of the original essay.
> > >
> > > Existence is finite. An orange is [part of] existence. An orange is finite, it's limited. The orange is limited to the orange. However existence is also unlimited, existence is infinite. Existence is the orange, and the tree, and the grove, and the farm, and the town, and the nation, and the planet and so on.
>
> BUT, 'existence' IS 'existence'. AND, just like A 'tree' is NOT an 'orange', a 'grove', a 'farm', a 'town', a 'nation', NOR a 'planet', so to is 'existence', itself, NOT ANY of those things AS WELL.

A tree, part of existence, is part of a grove, a larger part of existence, which is part of a planet, a larger part of existence. All is existence.

Just because a tree isn't a grove or a town doesn't mean all aren't [parts of] existence.

Powered by phpBB® Forum Software © phpBB Limited
Privacy | Terms